



State of Wisconsin \ DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

www.dnr.state.wi.us
www.wisconsin.gov

*Quality Natural Resources Management
Through Excellent Customer Service*



3550 Mormon Coulee Rd.
La Crosse, Wisconsin 54601
Telephone 608-785-9000
FAX 608-785-9990

Jim Doyle, Governor
Scott Hassett, Secretary
Scott Humrickhouse, Regional Director

March 7, 2003

James Nissen
US Fish & Wildlife Service
555 Lester Ave.
Onalaska, WI 54650

Subject: draft EA for Rosebud Island Protection Project

Dear Mr. Nissen:

Below are our comments on the "draft "Rosebud Island Protection Project" dated February 2003.

Overall the draft EA looks very good and complete. A few minor changes are recommended.

1. **In 1.2 Need, first paragraph.** It may be useful to mention not only the value of existing vegetation to fish and wildlife but also the value of maintaining bathymetric diversity to both fish and wildlife. In our opinion, there would likely be less bathymetric diversity during and after islands erode.
2. **In 1.4 Background, last paragraph.** Shouldn't "southeast" read "southwest"?
3. **In Figure 4.** It would be useful to add water surface elevation to the cross sectional view in the upper right corner of the figure as you did in Figure 3.
4. **Chapter 2 Alternatives.** We have a couple of additional alternatives that you may wish to consider and include in the final EA. You may want to bring in and place rock and logs during ice-over, which may reduce costs and any access dredging. Although this alternative may make it

more difficult to construct the mounds. Also, you may wish to evaluate constructing all near-shore mounds as opposed to your preferred alternative.

5. In **2.2.1 Alternative A (Proposed Action) paragraph 5**. It may be useful to the reader to explain why more rock is used in the offshore structures compared to near shore wedges.
6. In **4.1.4 Cumulative Impacts, paragraph 5**. Please describe where Mosey Landing is located. Also, evaluate access from along Fisherman's Road. Since Mosey Landing can be a very busy location at particular times of the year, we are concerned that access by recreationalists may be further limited during and because of off-loading operations.

In the analysis of alternatives, you may wish to include the alternative of hauling materials during ice-cover and constructing during the winter. It would be useful to have cost estimates of access dredging for the construction of all near-shore mounds as opposed to your preferred alternative and compare these to winter hauling and construction.

7. We think it is important to design the offshore mounds such that they provide for the escape of fish during falling water levels. It appears that the configurations and designs depicted in figures 4 and 6 provide this.

Sincerely,

David J. Heath, Mississippi River Fisheries Manager